

ASK/nlh

cc: Mr. James Coyne King
Mr. Ron Feldman

[FR Doc. E9-5018 Filed 3-9-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers

Notice is hereby given that, on February 9, 2009, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (“the Act”), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (“IEEE”) has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing additions or changes to its standards development activities. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act’s provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, 34 new standards have been initiated and 9 existing standards are being revised. More detail regarding these changes can be found at <http://standards.ieee.org/standardswire/sba/12-10-08.html> and <http://standards.ieee.org/standardswire/sba/01-30-09.html>.

On September 17, 2004, IEEE filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 3, 2004 (69 FR 64105).

The last notification was filed with the Department on November 17, 2008. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on December 11, 2008 (73 FR 75469).

Patricia A. Brink,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. E9-4853 Filed 3-9-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-63,422]

Springs Global U.S., Inc., Springs Direct Division, Springmaid Wamsutta Factory Store, Lancaster, SC; Notice of Revised Determination on Remand

On February 6, 2009, the U.S. Court of International Trade (USCIT) remanded to the U.S. Department of Labor (Department) for further review *Former Employees of Springs Global, Inc., Springs Global Direct Division, Springmaid-Wamsutta Factory Store, Lancaster, South Carolina (FEO Springs Global) v. United States*, Court No. 08-00255.

On May 19, 2008, an official of Springs Global U.S. Inc. (subject firm) filed a petition for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA) on behalf of workers of Springs Global U.S. Inc., Springs Global Direct Division, Springmaid-Wamsutta Factory Store, Lancaster, South Carolina (subject facility).

The subject facility closed during February 2008. Prior to the closure, workers at the subject facility managed Springs Global, U.S., Inc. (subject firm) retail operations, sold linen products manufactured by the subject firm to the public and other subject firm employees, and handled special orders for linen products placed by other subject firm employees.

The negative determination, issued on May 30, 2008, stated that in order to be considered eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under Section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974, the subject worker group must work for a “firm” or appropriate subdivision that produces an article domestically and there must be a relationship between the workers’ work and the article produced by the workers’ firm or appropriate subdivision. The determination also stated that although the subject firm produced an article, the subject workers did not support that production. The Department determined that the subject worker group cannot be considered import impacted or affected by a shift in production of an article. The Department’s Notice of determination was published in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 2008 (73 FR 34044).

The Department did not receive a request for administrative reconsideration.

In the complaint, Plaintiffs allege that workers at the subject facility, who “provided the means by which Springs

Global dispensed of manufactured goods that were not able to be sold otherwise * * * thereby enabling the company’s production operations * * * to reduce their per-unit overhead and operate more efficiently,” should be treated like the workers covered by TA-W-62,768 (Springs Global U.S., Inc., Springs Direct Division, Corporate Support Group, Lancaster, South Carolina; certified February 14, 2008). Workers covered by TA-W-63,422 are located in the same building as workers covered by TA-W-62,786.

Workers covered by TA-W-62,786 are engaged in production estimation, production scheduling, distribution, logistics, and operational services. The determination for TA-W-62,786 stated that the workers supported production at a TAA-certified facility (Springs Global U.S., Inc., Grace Complex, Bedding Division, Lancaster, South Carolina; TA-W-61,258) and that the worker separations are “related to a shift of production and increased imports of textile products.”

The group eligibility requirements for directly-impacted workers under Section 222(a) the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, based on a shift of production are satisfied if the criteria set forth under Section 222(a)(2)(B) have been met:

A. a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers’ firm, or an appropriate subdivision of the firm, have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated; and

B. there has been a shift in production by such workers’ firm or subdivision to a foreign country of articles like or directly competitive with articles which are produced by such firm or subdivision, and one of the following must be satisfied:

1. the country to which the workers’ firm has shifted production of the articles is a party to a free trade agreement with the United States;

2. the country to which the workers’ firm has shifted production of the articles is a beneficiary country under the Andean Trade Preference Act, African Growth and Opportunity Act, or the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act; or there has been or is likely to be an increase in imports of articles that are like or directly competitive with articles which are or were produced by such firm or subdivision.

On remand, the Department carefully reviewed the language of the statute, the Department’s policy, Plaintiffs’ submissions, and the administrative record.

The intent of the Department is for a certification to cover all workers of the subject firm or appropriate subdivision who were adversely affected by increased imports of the article